UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,678	03/31/2001	Wai H. Pak	SBL0007US	6116

60975 7590 01/22/2008		EXAMINER
CAMPBELL STEPHENSON LLP		BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R
11401 CENTURY OAKS TERRACE		
BLDG. H, SUITE 250	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
AUSTIN, TX 78758	2155	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/22/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/823,678	PAK, WAI H.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Benjamin R. Bruckart	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 October 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *23-96 and 99* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *23-96 and 99* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Status of Claims:

Claims 23-96, 99 are pending in this Office Action.

Claims 1-22 and 97-98 remain cancelled.

There are no claim amendments.

Claim 99 is new.

The 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection is withdrawn based on applicant's amendments.

The 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection is withdrawn as necessitated by applicant's amendment.

35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 46-64, 81-96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory inventions.

Claims 23-36, 99 are drawn to a method of inter-module communication and is statutory because it falls within the statutory class of a process.

Claims 37-45 and 73-80 are drawn to a computer system with a processor and computer readable storage media with code to perform the steps of the invention and is statutory because it is embodied and executed on hardware. (see specification page 567)

Claims 46-54 and 81-88 are drawn to a computer program product comprising instructions, executable on a computer system, configured to perform the steps of the invention.

These limitations are directed to non-statutory subject matter. The existence of many software

aspects and limitations in the specification do not embody this claim in a statutory manner. Just

because it is executable on a computer system, does not mean it is and therefore the claim is

software.

Claims 55-64 and 89-96 are drawn to an apparatus performing the steps of the invention.

The claim doesn't seem to have a clear definition in the specification. An apparatus can be

construed to be software (see specification para 557, 558, 560-563) because it is not limited to

hardware only. Because it is unclear it can be interpreted as software and is therefore rejected.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/31/07 have been fully considered but found not

persuasive. See new grounds of rejection and arguments below.

Applicant's invention as claimed:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis

for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed
in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for
patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an
international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this
subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United
States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 23-96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,772,216 by Ankireddipally et al (herein after "Ank").

Regarding claim 23, a method of inter-module communication (Ank: col. 6, lines 49-55) comprising:

forming a message (Ank: col. 5, lines 2-5), wherein

said forming comprises

inserting customer relations management system information (Ank: col. 7, lines 1-17; col. 6, lines 41-46; the data) and other customer relations management system information into said message (Ank: col. 7, lines 1-17; message exchange semantics); and

configuring said message to be pushed from a customer relations management system by encoding at least a portion of said message in a mAnkup language (Ank: col. 7, lines 1-17; message encoded in XML and transmitted Fig. 6),

said customer relations management system information comprises at least one of agent information and work item information (see next two limitations),

said agent information comprises information regarding an agent (Ank: col. 4, lines 62-65; protocol of the agent),

said work item information comprises information regarding a work item (Ank: col. 6, lines 14-21; format and standard),

said other customer relations management system information is other than said agent information and said work item information (Ank: col. 7, lines 1-17), and

said other customer relations management system information comprises at least one of a command, request, and a notification (Ank: col. 7, lines 1-17; message exchange semantics).

Regarding claim 24, the method of claim 23, wherein

said notification comprises at least one of notification of an event and autonomously provided information (Ank: col. 7, lines 40-61).

Regarding claim 25, the method of claim 23, wherein

said customer relations management system information further comprises at least one of

queuing information, statistical information, connection information (Ank: col. 16, lines 26-

31; connection information) and rule information.

Regarding claim 26, the method of claim 23, further comprising:

communicating said message from a commerce server to a universal queuing system

(Ank: col. 18, lines 43-57)

Regarding claim 27, the method of claim 23, wherein

said other customer relations management system information comprises said command, said

command configured to cause a module receiving said message to perform an operation (Ank:

col. 18, lines 58-67).

Regarding claim 28, the method of claim 23, wherein

said other customer relations management system information comprises said request, said

request configured to cause a module receiving said message to reply with requested customer

relations management system information (Ank: col. 7, lines 43-59; Fig. 6).

Regarding claim 29, the method of claim 23, wherein

said other customer relations management system information comprises said

notification, said notification is generated by a module generating said message (Ank: col. 8,

lines 44; col. 18, lines 34-39).

Regarding claim 30, the method of claim 23, wherein

said message defines a function, and

said function is one of an agent-related function, a work item-related function, a statistics-related

function and an administrative function (Ank: col. 18, lines 34-67).

Regarding claim 31, the method of claim 23, wherein

said agent-related function is one of an AgentLogin command, an AgentLogout command, an AgentInitAuxWork command, an AgentAllMediaAvailable command, a ChangeAgentMediaMode command, a ChangeAgentskill command, a RequestAgentstate request, a RequestAgentMediaMode request, a Requestsystemstate request, a RequestAgentWorkableList request, a RequestWorkItemAssignment request, a RequestAgentWorkItemList request, and a RequestAgentMediastate request (Ank: col. 18, lines 24-42).

Regarding claim 32, the method of claim 23, wherein

said work item-related function is one of an AddWorkItem command, a RequestWorkItemstatus request, an AcceptWorkItem command, a RejectWorkItem command, a CompleteWorkItem command, a WrapupWorkItemResponse command, a WrapcompleteWorkItem command, an HoldWorkItem command, an UnldoldWorkItem command, a BlindTransferWorkItemToAgent command, a TransferWorkItemToAgent command and a TransferWorkItem-roRoute command (Ank: col. 18, lines 24-58).

Regarding claim 33, the method of claim 23, wherein

said statistics-related function is one of a SetchannelstatInterval command, a SetRoutestatInterval command, a StartAgentstat command, a StopAgentstat command and a Getsystemstatistics request (Ank: col. 7, lines 57-61).

Regarding claim 34, the method of claim 23, wherein

said administrative function is one of a UQopenconnection command, a UQReopenconnection command, a UQInitRules command, a UQReplaceRules command and a UQDisconnect command (Ank: col. 3, lines 44-53).

Regarding claim 35, the method of claim 23, further comprising:

sending said message (Fig. 6).

Regarding claim 36, the method of claim 35, further comprising:

receiving said message (Fig. 6).

Claims "37-96" are substantially similar to claims 23-36 and are therefore rejected according to the same rationale as cited above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 99 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 6,772,216 by Ankireddipally et al (herein after "Ank") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20010024497 by Campbell et al.

Regarding claim 99, the Ank reference teaches the method of claim 23. The Ank reference fails to teach channel drivers.

However, the Campbell reference teaches:

receiving incoming customer support requests at a communications server (Campbell: page 2, para 41), wherein said communication server receives said incoming customer support requests from a channel driver in communication with a communications channel (Campbell: page 2, para 41), and

causing said communications server to route said incoming customer support request as a work item to an assigned agent (Campbell: page 5, para 80, 82) in order to route customers to knowledgeable and available service agents for faster and more satisfactory processing of the request (Campbell: page 1, para 16-18)

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method as taught by Ank to include routing messages as taught by Campbell in order to route customers to knowledgeable and available service agents for faster and more satisfactory processing of the request (Campbell: page 1, para 16-18).

Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U. S. Patent No. 7,051,066 by Albert et al teaches routing messages based on type with forwarding agents to servers and services.

REMANKS

The applicant has provided arguments and one new claim off independent claim 23.

The Applicant Argues:

The Ank reference fails to teach forming and inserting into a message.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

The examiner maintains the rejection. The Ank reference does read on the limitations as claimed. Ank teaches forming and sending a message. It is clear from a read of the summary and background that Ank is concerned with sending data (messages) between modules and entities over networked connections in a certain format (Ank: col. 7, lines 1-17). The messages are transmitted with their format and structure. Applicant broadly claims and argues that two claimed "nouns" are not taught by Ank see arguments for 'customer relations management system information' and 'other customer relations management system information.' The examiner has show the data is the customer relations management information because the messages contain data related to "commerce services such as shopping carts, catalogs, e-commerce services" (see col. 6, lines 43-46). Such details easily reads on the broad claim limitations. Other customer relations management system information, which the examiner believes could easily be rejected under 112, second for failing to distinctly identify that which

applicant is trying to patent, is even broader and is easily read upon in col. 7, lines 1-17; because

Ank teaches message exchange semantics relating to the message for using by the business

applications i.e. format, protocol, type, etc.

The argument about encoding a mAnkup language is found in Ank as well. Ank teaches

encoding at least a portion of said message in a mAnkup language (Ank: col. 7, lines 1-17;

message encoded in XML and transmitted Fig. 6). Ank teaches using HTML, CGI, and XML as

formats in which the message is sent in. MAnkup languages are languages that use tags to denote

and teach attributes. See Fig. 2 and Fig. 5 which further reinforce the idea that Ank teaches

encoding the message in a markup language.

Conclusion

this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to

Benjamin R. Bruckart whose telephone number is (571) 272-3982. The examiner can normally

be reached on 8:00-5:30PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2155

SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER